



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,069	02/11/2004	Susan Q. Sanders	50160	2097
22929	7590	11/29/2009		
SHAPER ILLER LLP 1800 WEST LOOP SOUTH SUITE 1450 HOUSTON, TX 77027				
EXAMINER				
MORRISON, JAY A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2168				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/20/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/776,069

Applicant(s)

SANDERS ET AL.

Examiner

JAY A. MORRISON

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-43 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-11, 13-37, 39 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Pricewatch (www.pricewatch.com, webpages from 1/28/2003) in view of Yahoo (www.yahoo.com, webpages from 12/09/2002) and further in view of Lee et al. ('Lee' hereinafter) ("From Design Features to Financial Performance: A Comprehensive Model of Design Principles for Online Stock Trading Sites", Journal of Electronic Commerce Research, Vol 3, No. 3, 2002).

As per claim 1, Pricewatch teaches

An improved Internet Directory System, comprising: (page 1)

a lower level directory comprehensively referencing viable websites (WSs) relating to a category; (page 2)

the CDWs being identified participating in the System by the display by each CDW of a common licensed service mark, or a common URL portion functioning as a service mark, the common service mark being displayed by the hundreds of CDWs to indicate participation in a unique source of an internet directory system; (page 3)

and a business model imposed on the CDWs, by the DP or System, including standards of operation with respect to the provision of lower level directories. (pages 4-5)

Pricewatch does not explicitly indicate "at least one upper-level Directory Provider (DP), providing an upper-level directory of lower-level directories, the upper-level directory organized by at least upper-level fields and/or super-categories and categories (together, upper-level categories), and referencing hundreds of

independently owned (from each other and from the Directory Provider) for-profit lower-level directories Category Directory Websites (CDWs) related to the upper-level categories, the CDW's organized by lower-level categories and subcategories" nor "the hundreds of CDWs each providing at least".

However, Yahoo discloses "at least one upper-level Directory Provider (DP), providing an upper-level directory of lower-level directories, the upper-level directory organized by at least upper-level fields and/or super-categories and categories (together, upper-level categories), and referencing hundreds of independently owned (from each other and from the Directory Provider) for-profit lower-level directories Category Directory Websites (CDWs) related to the upper-level categories, the CDW's organized by lower-level categories and subcategories" (page 1) and "the hundreds of CDWs each providing at least" (page 1; it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expand the plurality shown in Yahoo to include hundreds or thousands, since it has been held that the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art (*St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bernis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch and Yahoo because using the steps of "at least one upper-level Directory Provider (DP), providing an upper-level directory of lower-level directories, the upper-level directory organized by at least upper-level fields and/or super-categories and categories (together, upper-level categories), and referencing hundreds of independently owned (from each other and from the Directory

Provider) for-profit lower-level directories Category Directory Websites (CDWs) related to the upper-level categories, the CDW's organized by lower-level categories and subcategories" nor "the hundreds of CDWs each providing at least" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by combining two well-known business concepts on two well-known internet sites into one. This gives the user the advantage of having more and better choices as a consumer.

Neither Pricewatch nor Yahoo "of uniform organization, comprehensiveness of reference and up-to-dateness"

However, Lee discloses "of comprehensiveness and up-to-dateness" (up-to-datedness and indepth analysis, table 1, page 132).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch, Yahoo and Lee because using the steps of "of comprehensiveness and up-to-dateness" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by providing important features on an e-commerce site to attract more business. This gives the user the advantage of being able to keep up with the latest trends and information.

As per claim 2, Pricewatch teaches

The CDWs are identified as participating in the System by display of a common URL portion. (page 5)

As per claim 3, Pricewatch teaches

the business model includes a standard of operation providing professional management. (page 5)

As per claim 4, Pricewatch teaches
the URL portion includes a TLD. (pages 1-3)

As per claim 5, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes a standard of operation providing a comprehensive listing of viable websites (WSs) related to the category for no charge. (page 4)

As per claim 6, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes a standard of operation, imposed on at least a subset of CDWs, providing a CDW offering web sites at least one of an option to move to a secure site to negotiate a purchase and an organization of pertinent comparative data on a subject within the category. (page 3 and 5)

As per claim 7, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes charging at least some WSs for enhanced reference. (page 5)

As per claim 8, Pricewatch teaches

the business model includes at least some WSs being charged for at least one service offered by a CDW. (page 5)

As per claim 9, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes a participating CDW providing advertising space on its site. (page 3)

As per claim 10, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes a CDW promoting, by advertising, at least one of its referenced websites. (page 3)

As per claim 11, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes at least one advertising/promotion firm that provides advertising/promotion for a category and/or a CDW site substantially in return for advertising space on a CDW site. (page 3)

As per claim 13, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes substantially funding operation of a CDW by payments from WSs. (page 4-5)

As per claim 14, Pricewatch teaches

the business model includes selection of categories for CDWs large enough to support a Category Directory Website and small enough to be managed according to the business plan. (page 1-2)

As per claim 15,

Pricewatch does not explicitly indicate "the System includes contracting by at least one DP with a plurality of CDWs to secure a comprehensive listing of CDWs with respect to at least one upper level category."

However, Yahoo discloses "the System includes contracting by at least one DP with a plurality of CDWs to secure a comprehensive listing of CDWs with respect to at least one upper level category." (page 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch and Yahoo because using the steps of "the System includes contracting by at least one DP with a plurality of CDWs to secure a comprehensive listing of CDWs with respect to at least one upper level category" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by combining two well-known business concepts on two well-known internet sites into one. This gives the user the advantage of having more and better choices as a consumer.

As per claim 16, Pricewatch teaches

the URL portion consists essentially of a TLD. (page 3)

Art Unit: 2168

As per claim 17, Pricewatch teaches
the URL portion comprises a TLD unique to CDWs and DPs in the system. (page
3)

As per claim 18, Pricewatch teaches
the business model includes at least website enhancement technology cost
effectively offered to appropriate referenced WSS. (page 3)

As per claim 19,
CDW's provide a comprehensive reference to WSS without charge to the WSS.
(page 3-4)

As per claim 20,
Pricewatch does not explicitly indicate "the Directory Provider comprises an ISP
or Search Engine."

However, Yahoo teaches "the Directory Provider comprises an ISP or Search
Engine." (page 1)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to combine Pricewatch and Yahoo because using the steps of "the
Directory Provider comprises an ISP or Search Engine" would have given those skilled
in the art the tools to improve the invention by combining two well-known business

concepts on two well-known internet sites into one. This gives the user the advantage of having more and better choices as a consumer.

As per claim 21, Pricewatch teaches

1) the category and 2) at least one field and/or super-category are both more than simply an indicator of city, state, region or nation. (page 3)

As per claims 22-36,

These claims are respectively rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2,16-18,3-5,9-10,20,11,6-7,21 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 37, Pricewatch teaches

the business model includes minimal standards for websites to be included in a directory, for updating website references including adding new websites and for deleting no longer viable websites and standards for certain quality of presentation for participating websites. (page 5)

As per claim 39, Pricewatch teaches

the upper level fields and/or super-categories and categories being organized to contain CDWs which pay the DP to be listed in one or more fields, the fee based on a number of web pages hosted or linked to the CDW. (page 5)

As per claim 41, Pricewatch teaches

Pricewatch does not explicitly indicate "the hundreds includes thousands".

However, Yahoo discloses "the hundreds includes thousands" (page 1; it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expand the plurality shown in Yahoo to include hundreds or thousands, since it has been held that the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art (*St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch and Yahoo because using the steps of "the hundreds includes thousands" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by combining two well-known business concepts on two well-known internet sites into one. This gives the user the advantage of having more and better choices as a consumer.

As per claim 42, Pricewatch teaches

the CDWs providing lists of business and/or web pages within their category and organizing those lists into sub-categories. (page 2)

As per claim 43, Pricewatch teaches

The directory website remitting value to a DP or system (page 2)

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pricewatch, Yahoo and Lee, and further in view of Morimoto (Publication Number 2002/0013774).

As per claim 12,

Neither Pricewatch, Yahoo nor Lee explicitly indicate “the business model includes offering webpage enhancement services at a volume discount.”

However, Morimoto discloses “the business model includes offering webpage enhancement services at a volume discount” (paragraph [0008]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch, Yahoo, Lee and Morimoto because using the steps of “the business model includes offering webpage enhancement services at a volume discount” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing economies of scale to determine prices. This gives the user the advantage of being able to get better prices if willing to spend more money.

5. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pricewatch, Yahoo, Lee and further in view of eBay (www.ebay.com webpages from 11/15/2002).

As per claim 38,

Pricewatch does not explicitly indicate "the business model includes the CDW being substantially funded through an offer of enhanced listings and value added services, including website enhancement technology where appropriate, to websites, such services tailored to a category and specifically designed to attract and retain viewers".

However, eBay discloses "the business model includes the CDW being substantially funded through an offer of enhanced listings and value added services, including website enhancement technology where appropriate, to websites, such services tailored to a category and specifically designed to attract and retain viewers" (table 6, listing enhancements).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch, Yahoo, Lee and eBay because using the steps of "the business model includes the CDW being substantially funded through an offer of enhanced listings and value added services, including website enhancement technology where appropriate, to web sites, such services tailored to a category and specifically designed to attract and retain viewers" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing enhancement of listings. This gives the user the advantage of being able to have options to help attract more buyers.

6. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pricewatch, Yahoo, Lee and further in view of Google (www.google.com webpages from 2/22/2002).

As per claim 40,

Pricewatch does not explicitly indicate "the CDWs contracting with an advertising/promotion firm for design, marketing and/or promotional services to be provided at no cost to the CDW while the advertising/promotional firm sells advertising spots on the CDW and collects the revenue generated".

However, Google discloses "the CDWs contracting with an advertising/promotion firm for design, marketing and/or promotional services to be provided at no cost to the CDW while the advertising/promotional firm sells advertising spots on the CDW and collects the revenue generated" (page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pricewatch, Yahoo, Lee and Google because using the steps of "the CDWs contracting with an advertising/promotion firm for design, marketing and/or promotional services to be provided at no cost to the CDW while the advertising/promotional firm sells advertising spots on the CDW and collects the revenue generated" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing enhancement of listings. This gives the user the advantage of being able to have options to help attract more buyers.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Yahoo does not teach "hundreds" or "thousands" of CDSs, however as previously submitted it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to expand the plurality shown in Yahoo to include hundreds or thousands, since it has been held that the mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art (*St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bernis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8). Applicant argues that the plurality shown in Yahoo cannot be expanded to the hundreds as claimed by the applicant, however it is further submitted that the Yahoo engine which constructs the list is simply duplicating the working parts and since such duplication has been done a plurality of times it is even more evident that duplication could be done into the hundreds supported by *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bernis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Applicant argues that the displaying of a common licensed service mark is not taught as displayed by Pricewatch. It is respectfully submitted that the claim language says "a commonly licensed service mark, or a common URL portion functioning as a service mark" , and it is respectfully submitted that Pricewatch teaches the "buy-online" is a common sURL portion which functions as a service mark (page 3). As previously

submitted, this is a common mark which indicates a particular service offered, and therefore the Pricewatch reference does teach this limitation.

Applicant argues that Lee does not teach the up-to-dateness and that - business model teach is different than that used in the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that the up-to-dateness of a website as taught by Lee (page 132, table 1) can be used to modify the primary reference in terms of keeping a website up-to-date. The Pricewatch i Yahoo references teach the pertinent limitations related to the claimed subject matter, and adding the Lee reference to teach the additional element related to websites and business requirements would be the same regardless of the particular business performed online. These concepts are equivalent across any business online and it is simply prudent to ensure that a website does not contain stale data which does not accurately describe information to a customer. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that a combination of the cited references does teach these limitations.

Applicant argues that Pricewatch does not provide for the limitation of the business model including a standard of operation providing professional management. It is respectfully submitted that the requirement listed on page 5 of the Pricewatch reference teaches, among other things, providing tech support. This can be considered professional management since the limitation can be broadly interpreted since it is not further defined in terms of what is being managed. In addition, the requirement that the advertising business have at least 1 year of business also means that the business

would inherently have professional management since a business cannot run for such a length without such management. Therefore it is submitted that the limitations are taught by the cited references.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tim T. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100